# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX


## MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 May 2000

**AM** 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes: 19 April 2000

B. Dates of next meetings: 15 June 2000
20 July 2000

C. The Commission's 90th year: established 17 May 1910 and the Shipstead-Luce Act's 70th year: approved 16 May 1930.

D. Report on the site visit to the mockup of *VOYAGE: A Scale Model Solar System for the National Mall* (5 May 2000).

E. Staff report on the addition of a sculptural plaque to U.S. Navy Memorial to honor the LST crews.

F. Staff report on the redesign of the 2000 American Eagle Platinum Proof Coin.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service

CFA 18/MAY/00-1, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, West Potomac Park. Addition of new entrance "room" and sculpture. Concept.

B. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 18/MAY/00- 2, National Museum of the American Indian. The Mall, Independence Avenue and 3rd Street. Final. (Previous: CFA 17/JUN/99-1.)

C. General Services Administration

CFA 18/MAY/00-3, E. Barrett Prettyman U.S. Courthouse, Constitution Avenue and 3rd Street, NW. Annex building and renovation. Final. (Previous: CFA 20/MAY/99-5.)

D. Department of State

CFA 18/MAY/00- 4, New chancery for the Government of Pakistan. International Center, Lot 15. Final. (Previous: CFA 15/JUL/99-10.)

E. Department of Justice

CFA 18/MAY/00-5, Justice Department Building, Pennsylvania Avenue between 9th and 10th streets, NW. Guard booths at the garage entrances. Design.

F. Department of the Navy

CFA 18/MAY/00-6, U.S. Naval Observatory, 34th Street and Massachusetts Avenue, NW. Main Gate Entrance Signs. Design. (Previous: CFA 21/APR/99-5.)

G. Department of the Army

CFA 18/MAY/00-7, Fort McNair, 3rd Avenue, SW. Building 39. Restoration and renovation for offices. Design.

H. District of Columbia Public Schools

CFA 18/MAY/00-8, Eight District of Columbia Schools. Window replacement project (continued). Designs.

1. Birney Elementary School, 2501 M.L. King Ave., SE.
2. Burroughs Elementary School, 1820 Monroe St., NE.
3. Coolidge High School, 6315 5th St., NW.
4. Green Elementary School, 1500 Mississippi, Ave., SE.
5. Shadd Elementary School, 301 Douglas St., NE.
6. Kenilworth Elementary School, 1300 44th St., NE.
7. Luke Moore Academy, 1001 Monroe St., NE.
8. C.W. Harris Elementary School, 301 53rd St., SE.

(Previous: CFA 19/APR/00-19--Six District of Columbia Schools.)

I. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 00-112, 3700 O Street, NW. Georgetown University, Southwest Quadrangle. Three new buildings, mixed use. Concept development and landscaping. (Previous: O.G. 00-26, 20 January 2000.)

b. Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 00-059, 770 5th Street, NW. Avalon Bay Communities, Inc. New 12 story apartment building. Design development. (Previous: 19 April 2000.)

b. Appendix II.

## OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-81<br>HPA. 00-218 | 3100-A R Street, NW<br>Mr. and Mrs. Henderson<br>Residence | Raise level of rear patio - permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed alterations to raise the level of the side patio as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 24 April 2000.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-99<br>HPA. 00-266 | 3307 M Street, NW<br>East Banc Inc.<br>AT&T | Sign - permit |

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by case O.G. 00-156.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-100<br>HPA. 00-267 | 3620 Prospect Street, NW<br>Michael Lindsay<br>Residence | Rear addition and alterations to front for garage - permit |

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition and alterations to front facade for garage and stair as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 14 April 2000 and in supplemental information received and dated 16 May 2000. Working drawings for alterations conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 00-27).

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-125<br>HPA. 00-311 | 1334 Wisconsin Avenue, NW<br>Soleiman Brothers<br>Gilberto Aparicio | Replacement windows - existing -permit |

ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for existing replacement windows on second floor which were installed without permit or review by the Commission. Recommend sheet glass be removed and replaced with double hung wood windows to replicate original character of paired windows with central mullion.

---

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-128<br>HPA. 00-329 | 3255 M Street, NW<br>Mr. Dashdara<br>Luciano Couture | Signs -existing<br>- permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for existing circular sign on face of building above doorway reading "Luciano Couture" and the two small circular logos applied to the glass doors. The rectangular signs on transom above door and on left door reading "Luciano Couture", and the small free standing sign board, are **NOT APPROVED** and should be removed.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-129<br>HPA. 00-339 | 1506 Wisconsin Avenue, NW<br>Julia Botelson<br>Silver House | Sign - existing<br>- permit |

ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for existing sign of pin-mounted letters reading "Silver House" which was installed without permit or review by the Commission. Applicant failed to attend the Old Georgetown Board meeting to discuss project.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-130<br>HPA. 00-346 | 1611 Wisconsin Avenue, NW<br>Pamelia Kinser<br>Reed Electric Co. | Awning<br>- permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed shed-type awning in Sunbrella fabric #8631 burgundy color without lettering as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 26 April 2000. Existing canopy is to be removed. See previous Action (O.G. 00-105).

---

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-133<br>HPA. 00-361 | 2909 M Street, NW<br>Circle Management<br>Kress Cox Associates | Alterations for new windows - permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed alterations to infill rear garage opening with Kolbe & Kolbe 2 over 2 double hung, aluminum-clad true-divided-light wood windows as shown in supplemental information received and dated May 2000.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-134<br>HPA. 00-353 | 3417 Volta Place, NW<br>Alexander Graham Bell<br>Association for the Deaf<br>Volta Bureau | Alterations, roof addition and replacement windows - conceptual |

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case was superseded by case O.G. 00-168.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-135<br>HPA. 00-352 | 3000 K Street, NW<br>Crescent Washington Harbour LLC<br>Potomac Riverboat Company | Information and ticket kiosk on public space - permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for temporary seasonal installation of proposed information and ticket kiosk located in public space on waterfront of the Washington Harbor complex.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-136<br>HPA. 00-354 | 3052 P Street, NW<br>Kaufman and Waldman<br>Residence | Rear extension of ground floor and alterations to rear - permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed alterations and extension of ground floor at rear of dwelling as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 May 2000.

---

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-138<br>HPA. 00-356 | 2919 Olive Street, NW<br>Meaghan Beaumont<br>Residence | Alterations to rear<br>- conceptual |

ACTION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 26 April 2000 indicate that proposed work is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-139<br>HPA. 00-357 | 3336-3340 M Street, NW<br>East Banc, Inc.<br>The Valentino Project<br>Design Center West | Alterations and<br>rear addition<br>- permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed alterations and rear addition to the structures at 3336-40 M Street, part of the Design Center West project, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 27 April 2000. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 00-115). Erect material sample panels on site for approval by the Commission before contracting for materials. Coordinate with project for Cady's Alley for sign and lighting schemes around alley. Signs for tenants, which are not included in this approval, must be submitted to the Commission for review with permit application. Note is made that project is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further reviews in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-142<br>HPA. 00-360 | 3300 block M Street,<br>C & O Canal Towpath<br>National Park Service<br>East Banc, Inc.<br>Cady's Alley projects | Landscaping above<br>retaining wall - permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed landscape design as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 25 April 2000. Landscape plan has been coordinated with and approved by the National Park Service as owner of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. See previous Action (O.G. 99-229).

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-143<br>HPA. 00-363 | 3316 M Street, NW, rear<br>3330 M Street, LLC<br>East Banc, Inc.<br>Commercial | Retaining wall and terrace - revision to permit - permit |

ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed revisions to approved design for alterations to alley facade as shown in options and supplemental drawings received and dated 11 May 2000. Recommend previously approved alley facade of punched openings and masonry piers be retained. Project is part of the Design Center West project. No objections to issuance of permit for proposed revisions to the elevation facing C & O Canal or to the proposed addition of retaining wall and terrace as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 28 April 2000. Erect material sample panels on site for approval by the Commission before contracting for materials. Coordinate with project for Cady's Alley for sign and lighting schemes around alley. Signs for tenants, which are not included in this approval, must be submitted to the Commission for review with permit application. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further reviews in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval. Landscape plan along the Canal has been coordinated with National Park Service and approved in separate Action (See case O.G. 00-142). See previous Action (O.G. 00-50).

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-144<br>HPA. 00-364 | 3021 O Street, NW<br>Peter and Rosa Schecter<br>Residence | Enclosure of rear porch 2nd floor - concept |

ACTION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 26 April 2000 indicate that proposed work is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

---

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-146<br>HPA. 00-366 | 1627 35th Street, NW<br>John and Heidi Scanlon<br>Residence | Rear fence and alterations to front walk<br>- conceptual |

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed rear fence and alterations to front walk and stairs. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-156<br>HPA. 00-398 | 3307 M Street, NW<br>East Banc Inc.<br>AT&T | Awning and sign<br>- permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for single shed-type awning in Sunbrella fabric #4601 Pacific Blue color, matching the existing configuration and alignment of the red awnings on the Staples storefront to the immediate east. The awning will have white vinyl lettering reading "AT&T" on 12-inch valance as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 4 May 2000.

---

**ADDENDUM**

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-125<br>HPA. 00-311 | 1334 Wisconsin Avenue, NW<br>Soleiman Brothers<br>Gilberto Aparicio | Replacement windows - existing -permit |

ACTION: On HOLD until Old Georgetown Board meeting 6 July 2000 for further review at the written request of applicant.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-129<br>HPA. 00-339 | 1506 Wisconsin Avenue, NW<br>Julia Botelson<br>Silver House | Sign - existing<br>- permit |

ACTION: On HOLD until Old Georgetown Board meeting 1 June 2000 for further review at the written request of applicant.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-143<br>HPA. 00-363 | 3316 M Street, NW, rear<br>3330 M Street, LLC<br>East Banc, Inc.<br>Commercial | Retaining wall and terrace - revision to permit - permit |

ACTION: No objections to issuance of permit for proposed revisions to approved design of the elevation facing C & O Canal or to the proposed addition of retaining wall and terrace as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 28 April 2000. Project is part of the Design Center West project. Supplemental drawings received and dated 22 May 2000 indicate that there is no change to the approved design for the elevation off the alley. Erect material sample panels on site for approval by the Commission before contracting for materials. Coordinate with project for Cady's Alley for sign and lighting schemes around alley. Signs for tenants, which are not included in this approval, must be submitted to the Commission for review with permit application. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further reviews in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval. Landscape plan along the Canal has been coordinated with National Park Service and approved in separate Action (See case O.G. 00-142). See previous Action (O.G. 00-50).

---

# SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-066<br>HPA. 00-340 | 2653 Connecticut Avenue, NW<br>Jim Plugge Restaurant | Replacement windows and canopy - Permit |

ACTION: Out-of-Jurisdiction. (Returned to Permit Processing Division, 2 May 2000.)

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-067<br>HPA. 00-388 | 1913 Massachusetts Avenue, NW<br>Riggs National Bank | Facade restoration<br>- Permit |

ACTION: Out-of-Jurisdiction. (Returned to Permit Processing Division, 2 May 2000.)

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-069<br>HPA. 00-402 | 2053 Park Road, NW<br>M. Collison Residence | New Garage<br>- Concept |

ACTION: No objection to concept design for new garage to be built on existing concrete slab foundation. Recommend additional study to reduce height of south wall by at least two feet, to keep in character with other ally structures. File new submission of working drawings, including details with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L.00-070 | 1935 Upshur Street, NW<br>A. Gross Residence | Addition and alterations<br>- Permit |

ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed two story addition and alterations to single family residence as proposed in drawings received and dated 5 May 2000. West elevation windows and rear glass-bock window are inappropriate to the scale and character of the house. Recommend additional study of west elevation to reduce monumental window and suggest using two double hung windows in place of glass block window on rear elevation. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

---

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-071<br>HPA.00-404 | 809 15th Street, NW<br>Southern Building Associates | Canopies for sidewalk café<br>- Permit |

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed four unenclosed canopies projecting into public space as shown in materials and drawings received and dated 5 May 2000. Canopies are to be attached to metal window frames only and support poles will be placed in weighted planters. The center two canopies will have 12 inch high, gold or white, lettering reading *Bobby Van's* on the valance. Free standing umbrellas may be used to supplement canopies for sidewalk café. See previous Action (S.L. 00-057).

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-072<br>HPA. 00-407 | 301 3rd Street, SE<br>B. Brannon Residence | Additions, alterations and repair - Concept |

ACTION: Out-of-Jurisdiction. (Returned to Permit Processing Division, 11 May 2000.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-073 | 1748 Portal Drive, NW<br>Gizaw Residence | Addition and renovation<br>- Permit |

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for two-story addition and alterations to single family dwelling as proposed in drawings received and dated 5 May 2000.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-074 | 2805 Chesterfield Place, NW<br>Travis Price Residence | New single family dwelling<br>- Permit |

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new single family dwelling as proposed in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 May 2000. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (S.L. 00-030, 2800 Block of Chesterfield Place, 16 December 1999).

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-075 | 1614 Tuckerman Street, NW<br>R. Wolff Residence | Rear deck<br>- Permit |

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for new deck at rear of dwelling as proposed in drawings received and dated 12 May 2000.

---

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-076 | 900 Water Street, SW<br>Steven Phillips<br>Phillips Flagship Restaurant | Canopy<br>- Permit |

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for canopy as proposed in drawings and materials received and dated 17 May 2000.

---

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX


## MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 May 2000

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices in the National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

Members present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Harry G. Robinson III, Vice-Chairman
Hon. Carolyn Brody
Hon. Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel
Hon. Ann Todd Free
Hon. Emily Malino
Hon. Eden Rafshoon

Staff present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Sue Kohler
Mr. Frederick J. Lindstrom
Mr. José Martínez-Canino

National Capital Planning Commission staff present: Ms. Nancy Witherell

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 19 April meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

15 June
20 July

C. The Commission's 90th year: established 17 May 1910; the Shipstead-Luce Act's 70th year: approved 16 May 1930. The Secretary observed that there was a long tradition of noting the Commission's anniversary at each May meeting, but he said it had only recently been realized that the Shipstead-Luce Act had been approved almost to the day twenty years later.

D. Report on the site visit of 5 May to the mockup of *VOYAGE: A Scale Model Solar System for the National Mall*. The Chairman asked Ms. Malino to report on the outcome of the inspection. Ms. Malino said it had been the unanimous feeling that the vertical elements marking the position of the planets were too small. Also, it was thought that the legends should be moved up somewhat and made more legible, and that the letters should be 3/4 rather than 1/2 inch in height. The Secretary thought the Commission should write a letter to the Smithsonian stating the conclusions the members had reached; it was unanimously agreed that this should be done. Exhibit A

E. Staff report on the addition of a sculptural plaque to the U.S. Navy Memorial to honor the LST crews. The Secretary reported that he and Ms. Kohler had inspected the final maquette at the studio of the sculptor, Leo Irrera. He said it followed the pattern of previous plaques, but he commented that there were several figures in extremely high relief which seemed divorced from the rest of the action and tended to look like toy soldiers; he noted also that they might pose a vandalism problem. The Chairman suggested that Mr. Atherton write a letter pointing these things out. Exhibit B Letter not written?

F. Staff report on the redesign of the reverse of the 2000 American Eagle Platinum Proof Coin. Staff member Sue Kohler said the Mint had sent the staff a revised drawing soon after the April meeting, in response to the Commission's concerns, and she recalled that the members had received this drawing in their pre-meeting package. She showed the drawing, pointing out the new numeral nine with a longer "tail", which she thought would solve the problem of mistaking it for a zero. She noted also that all letters and numbers would be incused and polished, which would effectively set them apart from the patterned background. She also pointed out a stream in the background, added in response to the Secretary's statement that eagles do not soar over areas where there is no water; she noted that, as Mr. Atherton pointed out in his letter to the Mint, it was "quite modest". The Chairman suggested that the staff draw the Mint's attention to it and ask if it could be made more prominent. Other than that, the revised design was seen as an improvement and unanimously approved. Exhibit C

## II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

### A. National Park Service

CFA 18/MAY/00-1, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, West Potomac Park. Addition of new entrance "room" and sculpture. Concept. The Secretary recalled the informal approval, in June 1998, of the concept of adding a statue of FDR in a wheelchair, and he said the architectural setting had developed in a manner similar to what had been discussed. He said the members would review the drawings at this meeting and would also see the sculptural concept for the first time. He asked John Parsons from the Park Service to begin the presentation.

Mr. Parsons said he was pleased to bring this to the Commission, and he recalled that it had been three years since the memorial was dedicated–4 May 1997. He said the Park Service had worked closely with the National Organization on Disability, and he noted that the organization had raised 25% of the cost of the addition; he said the rest had come from federal funds. He said they were ready to begin construction as soon as they had obtained the Commission's approval, and they hoped to have the addition dedicated by President Clinton before he left office. Mr. Parsons then introduced architect Lawrence Halprin to discuss his design for the new "room".

Mr. Halprin said that at first he did not like the idea of adding the statue, since FDR had been so strongly opposed to being seen in a wheelchair. But, he said, the world had changed, and he had grown to like the idea. He said depicting FDR's disability in an appropriate way had been one of the most difficult things he had done in his professional career, and he hoped that it would be seen not as an addition but as part of the memorial that had always been there. He showed drawings of the new room, directly opposite the visitor's center, describing the enclosing walls and how they would be connected with the existing construction; all materials would be the same as those used in the existing memorial. He pointed out the proposed location for the sculpture, noting that it would be far enough out from the wall so that people in wheelchairs could go around it. On the wall would be a quotation from Eleanor Roosevelt about her husband's disability, how it affected him and how he dealt with it. Unlike the other quotations in the memorial, all of which came from FDR and were carved into the granite walls, this one would be etched onto a strip of bronze to set it apart. Below the quotation there would be a braille version, at a reachable height even for those in wheelchairs.

Mr. Halprin then asked the members to look at a model. He described the addition in more detail and answered questions. Ms. Diamonstein asked if the trees shown on the model already existed on the same scale so that the addition would be screened from the visitors center. Mr. Halprin said they did, and those that would die because of the construction would be replaced He then noted that etched on the floor would be the word "Prologue", in the same way as the dates of each of FDR's terms were etched on the floors of the existing rooms. There was a discussion as to whether the average visitor would know that FDR was disabled long before he became President, that his disability was the result of polio, that it continued through the rest of his life, etc. Ms. Diamonstein asked if there could at least be brackets placed within the quotation from Mrs. Roosevelt giving the date of the onset of his illness. Sculptor Robert Graham, who was present at the meeting, commented that there was an inscription within the memorial that gave the date after which he could no longer walk alone. He thought it would be better not to interrupt the quotation because it would destroy the rhythm that was set up as the visitor walked along to read it.

Mr. Graham was then asked to show a maquette of his bronze statue of Roosevelt seated in his wheelchair. He said he had worked from the original chair, which the President had designed, keeping all the proportions and details with one exception: He thought that, aesthetically, the rear wheel mechanism looked too lightweight and insubstantial to balance the rest of the composition, and so he had placed a box-like object between the back of the chair and the two rear wheels; he felt that it also increased the feeling of strength and added a throne-like character. He noted also that the front wheels as depicted in the sculpture were not actually spoked but were solid with spoke markings, and as they were not truly representational, he did not see any problem in departing from a true depiction of the rear wheels. He showed a photograph of Roosevelt in his wheelchair.

Before the addition and sculpture were discussed, the Chairman asked if there were any members of the audience who would like to testify. Michael Deland, chairman of the National Organization on Disability, was the first to speak. He said he had been a member of the committee to add a statue for five years, and he was very pleased with the outcome; he congratulated all those involved and said he especially liked the fact that the statue would be life-size and not monumental.

Mr. Deland was followed by Alan Reich, president of NOD. He said his organization felt a great responsibility in becoming associated with this project and felt privileged to have worked with the Congress, the Park Service, and others. Mr. Reich said visitors must find their first experience of the memorial a compelling one, and must leave with a new understanding. He said it must be made apparent that FDR had his disability before becoming President and had it all through the four terms of his presidency as depicted in the four rooms. He stressed that the wheelchair statue room must not be seen as an antechamber to the memorial; it must be an integral part of it, connected seamlessly to the other rooms. He observed that the statue would be of transcending importance to all visitors, disabled or not, young or old, and of all national origins; it would demonstrate the greatness of a country where even a severely disabled person could rise to the presidency, and for children, those who could not read English or were visually impaired, it would be the only way to get the point across.

Hugh Gallagher, author of *FDR's Splendid Deception*, spoke next. He said he had been especially pleased that the disabled community had been so closely involved with the planning of this addition to the memorial. He commented on Roosevelt's tremendous importance to the 20th century and said the statue would have a similar importance to disabled people everywhere; he added that all those in the disabled community were immensely grateful to Mr. Halprin and Mr. Graham for their work.

Mr. Deland asked to respond to two questions that had been raised: the "box" behind the chair, and the question about when FDR started using a wheelchair and how long he used it. In regard to the box, he said it made the chair look like it was battery-powered, and as there was a strong emotional difference in the wheelchair community between those who used motorized chairs and those who propelled themselves, he thought it should be clear from the statue that FDR's chair was one he pushed around. As for the date of onset and the length of his disability, he thought that if the wheelchair statue and the inscription were placed in the antechamber with the presidential seal, the visitor's first experience would not be seeing FDR in a wheelchair across from the visitors center, but at the very beginning of the memorial.

The last speaker was Jonathan Young, a Ph.D. candidate in American history who was writing about the history of the disability rights movement and the ADA. He thought there was something very significant about the fact the Roosevelt had acquired his disability many years before he became President, but he thought that was adequately brought out within the memorial; he also thought that curious visitors looking at the statue would ask the Park Service and the people who worked at the memorial about it, and so it would really not be necessary to spell everything out in the new room.

The Chairman then began the discussion of the addition and the sculpture. He said he found the sculpture immensely moving but was troubled by the box-like appendage; he said it was hard to be abstract and real at the same time. He thought if they were using the real chair as a model, then it had to be historically accurate. He also thought it would be very difficult for the Park Service to explain why the box was there. Ms. Diamonstein thought it detracted from the powerful likeness of the

President, and she found it "distracting and perhaps also historically jarring". Ms. Malino said that since Roosevelt had wanted the chair to be invisible, and as small as possible for mobility within the White House, such a non-real, bulky addition was not desirable; she thought the sculptor should try to reproduce the small bicycle wheels.

Mr. Graham, however, did not think the box was incongruous. He pointed out that the sculpture was not entirely realistic, that there was "surface" between the arms and the body, and a kind of webbing between the fingers that corresponded to the surface covering the rear wheel mechanism. He stressed that the chair was absolutely accurate, that all proportions were accurate and every screw was there. He said if the kind of license he had employed to give it some solidity was not allowed, then he did not know how to deal with it; he could not see the powerful figure of FDR seated on a minimal chair that looked just like the replica in the visitors center. The Chairman thought that was the point–to show the President in the kind of chair he used historically, not seated on a "throne". He did not think it important to show every nut and bolt, but if one did, it made it all the more misleading to alter the form and bulk. Mr. Deland asked to comment, saying that there was never any discussion about the box before the advisory committee, and he repeated his concern that it was going to be seen as a battery, and he was sure Roosevelt would never have used a battery-powered wheelchair.

Mr. Halprin said the discussion reminded him of the early days of the memorial, in 1974, when there were so many debates about whom and what should be included. He said the memorial had gradually been simplified, and there were even places where it departed a bit from history. He said this addition was departing from history by giving recognition in a way the President did not want. He made the point that a myriad of historically accurate details was not what made the memorial effective; rather it was the conveyance of the emotional quality of the times. To this end, he thought Mr. Graham's decision to make changes on an aesthetic or poetic level that would bring about a desired feeling of stability was a valid one and should be considered. He said he realized that NOD wanted everything to be very specific, but he thought they should realize that this was not a memorial to disability but a memorial to President Roosevelt. He also stated his position that the statue should not be placed, freestanding, in the middle of the memorial.

The Chairman agreed, and he was sure the other members did ,too, with Mr. Halprin's statement about the emotional power of the memorial. He thought the sculpture would be trivialized if it were placed in the first room, saying that it would be much more powerful out in front as Halprin had placed it. He saw this as a separate issue, one that could be voted on at this meeting. Mr. Brown then reviewed the Commission's role in the design of the memorial, noting that it was originally one-third larger than as built, and that the tightening up following Commission review had certainly increased its emotional power. He recalled, too, that the Commission had approved going to the great expense and trouble of adding an introductory room for the wheelchair statue, feeling that in this way it would affect the visitor's experience all the way through the memorial. As for the sculpture, he thought there could be another motion as to whether it could be approved as presented. He repeated his feelings about the need for the chair to be true to the historical one, and his belief that the requisite stability could be achieved without introducing planes, or "surface", which in itself suggested volume.

Ms. Diamonstein then moved that the Commission accept the design of the new room, including the placement of the sculpture; the Vice-Chairman seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. Ms. Malino moved that the concept of the sculpture be accepted but that the sculptor rethink the box

and come back with revisions. Ms. Diamonstein asked for an amendment, making the motion to accept the sculpture as presented with the exception of the portion that had been discussed. She commented on how incredible it was that the President was able to do what he did with such a disability, and that he was able to perpetuate the deception so long with the aid of his self-designed wheelchair, which the public never saw. Mrs. Brody seconded the motion as amended, and it was carried unanimously. Mr. Parsons asked if the approval of the sculpture also included the inscription, and he was told that it did.

A discussion with Mr. Halprin about the construction schedule followed. He said they were under great pressure to get it finished while Mr. Clinton was still President, and the contractor had said that would be difficult; a contract would have to be signed by 1 June. The Chairman noted that the sculpture would be the last thing to be put in place, but Mr. Halprin said despite that, it was still going to be difficult. Mr. Brown said that although the members were sympathetic to scheduling problems, it was the Commission's responsibility to get the memorial right for the centuries to come; he recalled that it had taken twenty-six years to get this far, and it should take as long as necessary to get the addition right. He stated, for clarification, that the Commission was enthusiastic about the sculpture and about the choice of the sculptor, feeling that Mr. Graham was exactly the right person for the job, and commenting that this work would provide continuity with the other work he had done within the memorial. The only question remaining was the rendering of the wheelchair, and the Commission wanted to see other possibilities. He found the openness of the real chair a great plus because it placed the emphasis on the man, and he hoped to see Mr. Graham study ways to make that part of the sculpture more transparent. Exhibit D

B. Smithsonian Institution

CFA 18/MAY/00-2, National Museum of the American Indian. The Mall, Independenee Avenue and 3rd Street. Final. (Previous: 17/JUN/99-1.) The Assistant Secretary said that since the last review, the Smithsonian and its architects had been studying materials, especially paving materials, and improvements to the water cascade at the northwest end of the building. He noted that there had been a site inspection on 5 May, and several members of the Commission, including the Chairman, had had a chance to see two potential paving materials. One was Jet Mist, a black granite with white veining; he showed a sample. He said the veining had a distinctive pattern, and in the pattern and the way the stone was laid, the paving was to evoke a river course. He recalled, however, that this was the same material that the Commission had worried about in previous meetings because it looked too much like an asphalt roadbed. He said the Smithsonian had looked at numerous other samples, and noted a box of them on a table. He said that in looking through them the staff had seen one that they thought was a possibility for the paving because it was in the same color family as the Kasota stone used for the walls. Mr. Carson then introduced Rick West, director of the museum, to begin the presentation.

Mr. West said the two issues now before the Commission had been aptly summarized by the Assistant Secretary, and he believed both either had been or could be resolved. He said he would simply like to turn the presentation over to the design staff to talk about what the issues had been and the attempts that had been made to resolve them. He introduced Bill Thomas, associate director of special projects, who in turn introduced architect Johnpaul Jones.

Mr. Jones referred to a model in the room of the north face of the building, suggesting that the members look at it to refresh their understanding of the water feature running the entire length of that facade. He said the cascade at the northwest corner, a welcoming feature, had been restudied, simplified, and its height reduced from 20 to 15 feet. The entire water feature had been reexamined and its character analyzed; he said they had brought boards to show all this if the members had questions. The final item was the granite paving material, and he said they were very flexible about this, wanting it to work for the Mall as well as the building. He said that after a lot of research they had narrowed the choices down to one preferred stone–American Mist, a lighter grey than the Jet Mist formerly selected. He showed a sample and then asked Gabrielle Tayac to talk about the history of the native people and the stone of the area.

Ms. Tayac , a member of the Southern Maryland Piscataway Indian tribe, said she had recently completed her doctoral thesis reconstructing a 500-year history of her people. She said they were primarily river people, as was true of all the Indians along the eastern coastal plain, and their lives, physical and spiritual, were closely bound to the rivers, which were considered connectors or highways, and were places of repose and reflection, as well as places of burial. She noted the importance of the Potomac River in this area, and the fact that the rotunda area of the museum was called the Potomac, or the gathering place. She recalled that in the blessing of the museum grounds in September her uncle, Chief Billy Tayac, had brought water from the Potomac and soil from its banks near the tribe's sacred site across from Mount Vernon. Lastly, she noted the quartzite veining in the American Mist granite, and said this was the material used by the Piscataway Indians for their arrowheads. Ms. Tayac then turned to landscape architect Roger Courtenay from EDAW to review the paving design and issues.

Mr. Courtenay showed a site plan of the museum, pointing out the light-colored Mall sidewalks around the edge of the property and the areas immediately adjacent to the building that would be paved in stone. He noted the paving pattern, resembling a flowing river in its design, and said the same pattern would continue beneath the actual water feature running along the north facade and down to the welcoming plaza at the east. He discussed the research the staff had done on the color of river stones in the area, the first preference for Jet Mist, and then the realization that the American Mist was better because of the character of its veining.

Mrs. Free thought that what the Commission had to consider was how the American Mist would look up against the building stone. The Chairman agreed, and Ms. Diamonstein asked to see a board with other granite samples on it. She said the building really needed to come from the earth, and she thought the grey of the American Mist tended to separate the two. She asked if the other samples on the board had been considered, and Mr. Courtenay said they had, and they had reached the conclusion that with the way the light hit the Kasota stone of the building, it was going to be very difficult to find a color within the range of those available in granite paving that would be similar to the Kasota stone and work well with it.

The Chairman said he understood that a base for the building had been introduced, and he asked Mr. Courtenay if he would elaborate on that, since he had thought that, originally, the building was to be organically part of the ground from which it arose. Mr. Courtenay said there had always been a base for the building, and Mr. Jones explained that the Kasota stone did not hold up to water and weathering where the building met the ground, and a harder stone was needed as a base. He commented that when

the staff had gone to Kasota to look at the stone and how it was mined, they had noticed that there was a layer of granite underneath in the same color range as American Mist.

Architect Tim Hartung from the Polshek Partnership asked to clarify the question of the base. He said there was no base on the south, east, or west sides of the building, and, in fact, no real base on the north. What happened there was that they had to go below grade with some of the interior spaces and the granite was exposed on the exterior, as it would be naturally when earth was dug out. Also, the granite was needed on the exterior because the water course would go right up against the building along the north side and the Kasota stone would not hold up with water rushing against it. The granite would be most visible at the northwest corner in the area of the cascade, where it would rise above the below-grade condition about 4 1/2 feet to accentuate the waterfall.

The Chairman commented on the use of grey stone to simulate a river bed, saying that he did not see why that was necessary when they already had a real watercourse right up against the building. He doubted if the average visitor would read the grey stone as a riverbed; he thought it would more likely be read as an asphalt parking lot, and he was worried about the over-urbanization of such a wonderful evocation of nature. Mr. Hartung explained that the stone paving actually represented a riverbed that was once filled with water, with the real watercourse seen as all that remained at present; it was part of the original design concept which saw the building as something that had been created over time by wind and water. There was a discussion about the size and shape of the paving stones and the finish, which it was agreed should be as rough as possible to take the urban feeling, the slickness, out of it. The Chairman was still concerned about the areas where there was no watercourse, and the warm Kasota stone and cold grey granite would come together. Mr. Jones recalled that in the early stages of the design they were actually worried that they were going too far to the natural side, and given the number of people visiting the Mall museums, they tried to widen the paved area, make it less trail-like, and bring a more urban feeling into the design.

The Vice-Chairman made a motion that the paving pattern be accepted both in its vertical and horizontal dimensions, and that the architects be asked to achieve as rough a surface as possible on the horizontal plane. Ms. Malino seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved. Elsa Jones then spoke briefly about the cascade at the northwest corner and showed drawings, pointing out the reduction in height and other changes that had been made. Ms. Malino recalled that the members had seen these boards on the site, and she said she considered the design greatly improved. The other members agreed, and the water feature was then unanimously approved. Exhibit E

(At the request of the Vice-Chairman, the agenda order was changed, and item II.H discussed next.)

H. District of Columbia Public Schools

CFA 19/MAY/00-8, Eight District of Columbia schools. Window replacement project (continued). Designs. (Previous: CFA 19/APR/00-19–Six D.C. Schools).

1. Birney Elementary School, 2501 Martin Luther King Avenue, S.E.
2. Burroughs Elementary School, 1820 Monroe Street, N.E.
3. Coolidge High School, 6315 5th Street, N.W.
4. Green Elementary School, 1500 Mississippi Avenue, S.E.
5. Shadd Elementary School, 301 Douglas Street, N.E.

6. Kenilworth Elementary School, 1300 44th Street, N.E.
7. Luke Moore Academy, 1001 Monroe Street, N.E.
8. C.W. Harris Elementary School, 301 53rd Street, S.E.

The Vice-Chairman asked if the Commission could give blanket approval to these window replaeement projects as long as the Corps of Engineers architects continued to work with the staff and maintained the same policy regarding the ratio of openings; in that way they wouldn't have to keep coming back. He put this in the form of a motion; it was seconded and carried unanimously. Mr. Lindstrom commented that this group followed the same pattern as seen with the first six schools; the same type of system had been used, and the replacements showed the same sensitivity to the building styles and to the sizes of the windows and doors. Exhibit F

(The Commission then returned to item II.C.)

C. General Services Administration

CFA 18/MAY/00-3, E. Barrett Prettyman U.S. Courthouse, Constitution Avenue and 3rd Street, N.W. Annex building and renovation. Final. (Previous: CFA 20/MAY/99-5.) The Assistant Secretary recalled that at the time of the last review there were only a few minor problems outstanding, and in the year that had passed, these had been addressed and would be presented for final review at this meeting. Also, the Commission would see a concept submission under GSA's Art and Architecture program for sculptural embellishment of the new building. He introduced architect Mike Crakel from Michael Graves's office to present the design changes and additions.

Mr. Crakel said the revisions were mostly confined to the east facade. He recalled that there had been a loggia in the central area, set back about 15 feet, but he said that because of security requirement required in the lobby, and space for people to queue up, they had had to give up much of that space, and the loggia feeling had been eliminated. He then showed the canopy design, saying that it would extend out about 18 feet, very close to the curb, and would cast a shadow, thus giving a clear idea of where the entrance was. The Chairman said that was what the Commission had asked for. Mr. Crackel noted also that flag poles on either side and a different treatment of the bollards directly in front would also serve to identify the entrance. The canopy would be lighted from underneath and would be clad in marble, the same stone used around the window surrounds

Mr. Crackel continued with a further discussion of materials. He said that, generally speaking, the building would have a base of Salisbury Pink Cold Spring granite, selected to come close to the granite on the base of the existing building. Above the base, limestone would be used up through the first floor, again in a color to come close to the limestone of the existing building; above that would be precast in a slightly lighter shade. The Chairman had some concern about stopping the limestone at such a low point on the entrance unit. He thought that if it were carried up to the point where the red precast was introduced and out as far as the bank of vertical windows, it would give the entrance some dignity and avoid an awkward change of materials in that area. Mr. Crackel then showed samples of the red precast and other trim materials–a bluestone to be used for some first-floor wall conditions and the white marble for the window surrounds. He noted, too, that the roof color had been changed from green to a greyish aluminum.

Bill Kane from GSA was then introduced to talk about the sculptural program and introduce the artist. He said GSA's Art and Architecture panel had chosen Mark Lineweaver as the sculptor, because of his skill in using traditional forms in a fresh and innovative way, one that would be compatible with Mr. Graves's architecture, the dignified civic function of the buildings, and the monumental core of the city surrounding the site. He said Mr. Lineweaver had developed a sculptural program for both the exterior and interior of the building. Showing renderings of the east elevation, he noted the sculptural elements in the lunette-shaped ends of the four barrel vaults and said they utilized heroic figures and idealized geometry to represent the citizen's relationship to the law. Mr. Kane then introduced the artist to give a more detailed explanation of his work.

Mr. Lineweaver said his challenge was to come up with an iconography that would describe law, do it in the simplest way possible, and evoke not only the ideal of law but also the dynamism and struggle involved in reaching it. Thinking of the ancient caryatid sculptures, he had used four heroic human figures, each struggling to support a rectangular object of apparently heavy weight. He said the figures might be judges struggling with their caseloads or their interpretation of the law, or they might be citizens involved in the judicial procedure.

The Chairman was afraid the average passerby would not understand the subtleties involved, and he was also concerned that there was too much emphasis on struggle, as though the legal system were crushing the citizen involved with it, rather than sorting things out and achieving equality and balance. He thought this was the wrong kind of image to put on a courthouse; he thought the message should be that society was coming out ahead, and was not oppressed by law. Ms. Diamonstein commented that there could be value in ambiguity, but she thought this had gone one step too far, and the public would not understand it. Ms. Malino agreed, commenting that while the caryatids bore their weight with grace, these figures seemed crushed by it. The Vice-Chairman, while noting that there was a certain amount of poetry in struggle and Mr. Lineweaver had brought this out forcefully, agreed with the others that people would not understand it. Mrs. Rafshoon observed that in the message of struggle Mr. Lineweaver had not included any message of hope or justice.

Mr. Kane asked Mr. Lineweaver if he thought his concept could be preserved and the concerns of the Commission addressed if the geometric forms the figures were struggling with could be held less askew and closer to a state of balance, and if the figures could be more robust in relationship to their burdens. Mr. Lineweaver said this was his first formalization of his concept, and it was normal for an artist to do a whole series. He said he was definitely looking for an optimistic solution, and he thought he could develop a new iconography that would be accepted, given the right proportions and the right timing. He said he appreciated the feedback and thought he and the Commission were on the same wavelength. The Chairman said the Commission was all for freshness and originality, and a new iconography for justice, but it needed to give a sense that the building was a positive element in our society and not just a source of hardship.

It was unanimously agreed that the sculpture could be considered a work in progress, but the final design for the courthouse was unanimously approved. However, Mr. Crackel had realized that he had neglected to present the final paving and landscaping designs and asked to do so at this time. He said the landscaping amounted mostly to hardscape. The landscaping in front of the original building would be undisturbed, and along Constitution Avenue, where the asphalt road had been removed, the plaza would be extended with slate pavers and granite bands on axis with the rotunda. The Blackstone

statue would be moved and placed on axis with the end of the atrium and with the rotunda. Standard D.C. precast pavers in a running bond pattern would be used for the sidewalk area around the annex, changing to a herringbone pattern in the entrance area on Third Street. The planters running around the building had been eliminated and replaced with bollards, illuminated in some cases, with an ochre-colored composite cladding, much like precast concrete, and a nickel silver finished metal top. A row of trees would be planted along Third Street. Street lights would be traditional single globe lights. Mr. Crackel then showed drawings of the precast guard booths with aluminum framed windows. There were no objections to the landscaping and paving plans, and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit G

(The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 1:16 p.m. and reconvened at 2:01 p.m.)

D. Department of State

CFA 18/MAY/00-4, New chancery for the Government of Pakistan. International Center,Lot 15. Final. (Previous: CFA 15/JUL/99-10) This project was postponed.

E. Department of Justice

CFA 18/MAY/00-5, Justice Department Building, Pennsylvania Avenue between 9th and 10th streets, N.W. Guard booths at garage entrances. Design. Mr. Lindstrom introduced Pam Rhame from the Justice Department to describe this proposal. Ms. Rhame said these guard booths would be at the 9th and 10th Street entrances. The existing bollards would be moved farther into the driveways to accommodate the guard booths. The booths would have granite bases, decorative aluminum panels, and a wire mesh-type roof; the reason for the mesh was to dissipate the heat from the air conditioning or heat pump unit on top of the booth. She passed around a photo of one design just to show the mesh roof but said they were proposing a more shallow roof. The Chairman and Ms. Diamonstein found the pyramidal roof on the square booth in the photo better-looking than the flatter one proposed by the Justice Department for their rectangular booth. It was suggested to Ms. Rhame that they use their design, which reflected the use of granite and aluminum on the Justice Department building, but use a steeper roof compatible with the shape of their booth. She was asked to bring a revised design to the staff for approval. Exhibit H

F. Department of the Navy

CFA 18/MAY/00-6, U.S. Naval Observatory, 34th Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Main gate entrance signs. Design. (Previous: CFA 21/APR/99-5). Mr. Lindstrom recalled that when this was presented a year ago it had been disapproved. Since then the Commission staff and the Planning Commission staff had been invited to look at the site and make suggestions. He said the design to be presented reflected some of the comments made. Larry Earle from the Navy was then introduced.

Mr. Earle said he had asked Mike Anderson from Architectural Innovations to join him. He said the most important thing to come out of the staff meeting was that it would take more than one sign to direct people driving along Massachusetts Avenue to the main entrance, and at the same time, mark the entrance to the Observatory at the circle inside the main gate at 34th Street. The Massachusetts

Avenue signs needed to be placed at a certain distance and angle to be effective, and the one at the main gate needed to be a more formal marking of the entrance. He asked Mr. Anderson to describe the new sign proposal.

Mr. Anderson said the Navy had preferred a simple, straightforward sign for both uses. He showed first the sign for the entrance, saying it would be placed within an existing Jersey barrier; the barrier would have a finish similar to the face of the sign, which would be light-colored with dark letters. For nighttime illumination, the letters would be lit internally.

There were objections to internally-lit signs in a residential neighborhood, and Ms. Diamonstein suggested using pin spots behind the plantings in front of the signs. Mrs. Brody was particularly concerned about the signs along Massachusetts Avenue; while she agreed that signs were needed, she thought brightly-lit signs would change the character of the avenue. She was particularly concerned about the one to the south of the entrance, near the British Embassy and asked if it could be moved a little to avoid marring a particularly nice, quiet stretch of the avenue.

Mr. Anderson showed drawings for these signs, and Mr. Lindstrom noted that they would be placed 200 feet north and south of the main entrance. Ms. Diamonstein made a motion that the adjustments suggested be made and that final approval be left to the staff, bearing in mind the wishes of the Commission; Ms. Malino seconded the motion. There was further discussion about the lighting and position of the sign south of the main gate. The Chairman asked for a vote, and as it was a tie, he cast his vote in favor of the signs, as long as they were not internally lit and were done discreetly. He said the other possibility was to table the vote until a site inspection could be arranged. Mr. Earle agreed that would not hold them up, and he would arrange for it just before the next meeting. No action was taken at this time. Exhibit I

G. Department of the Army

CFA 18/MAY/00-7, Fort McNair, 3rd Avenue, S.W. Building 39. Restoration and renovation for offices. Design. Mr. Lindstrom said this submission was for renovation of two McKim, Mead & White buildings dating from 1904 and originally used as warehouses; he noted their prominent location, on either side of the main gate. Building 48, on the west side, would need only minor brick restoration and cleaning, but Building 39 would undergo major renovation and restoration. The exterior would be restored to its original condition with the exception of the loading dock area. Since the building would be used for offices, the old metal roll-up doors would not be needed and would be replaced with a brick infill in a darker color than the walls. Mr. Lindstrom then introduced Myrtle Bowen from the Army's Department of Public Works to answer questions.

Ms. Bowen first thanked the Commission on behalf of the Fort Myer military community for its support for their work on their historical buildings, to the point that they had been recognized by the Secretary of the Army. As for the Fort McNair buildings, she said they had the historical drawings for them, and she would be happy to answer any questions the members might have. The Chairman said the materials had been circulated, and he sensed a tremendous enthusiasm for what was being proposed. There were no questions, and the Commission unanimously approved the project.
Exhibit J

I. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 00-112, 3700 O Street, N.W. Georgetown University, Southwest Quadrangle. Three new buildings, mixed-use. Concept development and landscaping. (Previous: O.G.00-26, 20 January 2000.) Mr. Martínez recalled that when the Commission reviewed the concept submission the members had some concerns about the details of the tower element on the Jesuit Community Center. To refresh their memories, he pointed out on a model the student residence hall and dining hall designed by Robert A,M, Stern, which would be built above an underground facility maintenance structure, and the Jesuit Community Residence by Einhorn, Yaffee, Prescott.

He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed the refinements to the tower, as well as the landscaping and some other details, and had approved them. He said the refinements would have been an appendix item, except for the Commission's concern. Mr. Martínez then introduced Alan Brangman from the university. Mr. Brangman said construction had already begun on the site, but they had come back to get approval of the tower details. He asked Steve Kleinrock from Einhorn, Yaffee, Prescott to make the presentation.

Mr. Kleinrock showed drawings, noting that they had truncated the top, added finials and some cresting, and made changes to the proportions of the fenestration. The Chairman thought it was a big improvement and said it reminded him of Memorial Hall at Harvard. Mr. Kleinrock asked about approval of materials, and Mr. Martínez said that would come later on with the permit application and construction drawings. There were no objections to the changes in the tower design, and they were unanimously approved. Exhibit K

(The Chairman and Mrs. Brody both left the meeting at this point; the Chairman turned the gavel over to the Vice-Chairman.)

b. Appendix I. Mr. Martínez said two items had been added to the Appendix; they had been placed on hold, but as no letter requesting an extension had been received from the applicants, and as the time had come for the Board had to act under the law, they appeared on the Appendix as disapprovals. There were no questions about the Appendix, and it was unanimously approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 00-059, 770 5th Street, N.W. Avalon Bay Communities Inc. New 12 story apartment building. Design development. (Previous: 19 April 2000) Mr. Lindstrom said architect Eric Colbert had returned with some refinements to his drawings as requested last month by the Commission, and he asked him to explain the changes he had made.

Mr. Colbert said he understood his mandate was to do two things: produce drawings that further articulated the "ins and outs" of the facade, and work with the staff to refine the details. He said he had clarified the double row of bays on either side of the building by using a different material for the small columns to give the bays more relief. He showed drawings that illustrated his point, and he also

showed drawings showing the relationship of the building to the smaller historic structure on the corner of 5th and G streets. He said the columns on the 5th Street elevation had been refined with the aid of the staff, and added that he would continue to work on them as well as on the pediments at the roof line. He noted that the entrance had been reworked, pointing out that in lieu of a canopy there would be a recessed entrance. Changes had also been proposed for the rear elevation, particularly the balconies; Mr. Colbert showed two schemes for further development, involving continuous or interrupted railings.

The Vice-Chairman asked Mr. Lindstrom for his assessment of the progress made. Mr. Lindstrom thought good progress had been made at the conceptual level, and further refinements, for example, to the capitals and bases of the columns, would fall under the design development stage. He thought the building had improved immensely. The Vice-Chairman said he would like to see more development of the cadence of the street-level facades. Mr. Colbert said only half the street frontage would be devoted to retail space; the other half would contain facilities for the residents and would not be entered from the street. The Vice-Chairman suggested that some changes in paving, addition of vegetation, or something else of that nature would help soften the effect of bringing the construction right out to the lot line. On the whole, however, he thought the design had come a long way in the past month.

Mr. Lindstrom asked the Commission to comment on the alley facade and the balconies. Ms. Diamonstein asked what the balconies faced and was told there was a wide alley, and here the building did not come right out to the lot line. He noted, however, that there was a possibility that another high-rise might be erected on the other side of the alley. Ms. Diamonstein observed that no matter how crowded the area, people liked to sit out on balconies. Mr. Lindstrom commented on the change from a very flat facade on the alley side to one in which the balconies projected out a little more, a change the members liked. There was general agreement that the scheme with the continuous railings was the better of the two shown. He said the staff had also suggested that the use of a darker brick on the base of the 5th Street facade be carried around to the rear to anchor the building all the way around; this, too, was considered an improvement. There was no further discussion, and the design was approved for further development along the lines seen. Exhibit L

b. Appendix II. Mr. Lindstrom described one minor addition to the Appendix, and it was then approved without objection.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

23 May 2000

Dear Mr. Rombach:

As you know, on 5 May 2000 members of the Commission visited the on-site mock-up of the Voyage model on Jefferson Drive. It was determined that the prototypical information pylon as proposed was a bit too small; it was lost when seen in the outdoor context, especially where the tourist crowds were dense.

In reporting back to their colleagues at the Commission meeting of 18 May 2000, the members recommended that the scale of the pylon be increased by one foot or so in height. It was understood that the other pylon elements, including the information panel, would increase similarly. One advantage to this larger scale is that the text would be more legible to a greater number of people. By the way, everyone is pleased by the choice of material, a brushed steel.

For our records, the Commission requires a revised set of working drawings based on the above recommendations. As always, the staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Harry Rombach, RA
Assistant Director for Facilities Planning
Smithsonian Institution
Office of Physical Plant
955 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Suite 3230
Washington, D.C. 20024-2119

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

May 11, 2000

Dear Mr. Szcerban:

Thank you for sending over the modified rendition of the Platinum Proof Bullion Coin. The use of numeral 9 with a longer "tail" should greatly increase legibility, as will the fact that the numerals and letters will be incused and polished.

I must say the added "stream" is quite modest, in fact, were it not for the note on the drawing, it might have totally escaped notice. Let us hope that our concern for this detail is shared by very few others.

With best wishes,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Jack Szcerban
Senior Brand Manager
American Eagle Program
United States Mint
801 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20220

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

May 23, 2000

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

During its meeting of 18 May 2000, the Commission reviewed and approved the proposed concept design for an addition to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial. Unlike the existing memorial, which depicts the four administrations of the President, this is intended to say something personal about the man himself, his triumph over great physical adversity.

The Commission members were unanimous in their praise of Larry Halprin's new space, the powerful line quoted from a statement by Eleanor Roosevelt, rendered in bronze, and the seated figure of Roosevelt by Robert Graham.

The architectural design was approved. The part of the sculpture representing Roosevelt was also approved, with great enthusiasm. The interpretation of the historical wheelchair that Roosevelt designed himself was unanimously considered, however, a falsification of the historical fact. The President designed the wheelchair with the idea that it be highly maneuverable. The "box" element added by the sculptor does the very opposite. It appears to have dragged the President to a standstill; it is a static thing, rather than the light and agile vehicle the President wished it to be. American visitors, always interested in technology, will assume that the sculptor's form replicates an historically accurate chair, given the degree of detail that the artist has rightfully kept in it. As the whole purpose of this addition is to get away from mythology and show Roosevelt, at human scale, the way he really was, the chair needs to do its part. Luckily, the lighter it appears, the more formidable the figure sitting on it will appear by contrast.

The Commission looks forward to another look at Mr. Graham's work. In addition, working drawings for the addition should be provided when they become available. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Terry R. Carlstrom
Regional Director, National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, D.C. 20242

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

23 May 2000

Dear Mr. Sofield:

During its meeting of 18 May 2000, the Commission was pleased to approve the final design for the proposed National Museum of the American Indian on the Mall. The two items that continued to raise concern have been addressed with varying degrees of success.

The cascade element at the northwest corner of the museum now appears to be a natural part of the landscape and yet clearly part of the building, which itself seems to have grown from the bedrock. The result is well worth the effort and time spent.

The second item is the paving. The American Mist granite is an improvement over the Jet Mist as a pavement material, and is approved. While the color shift is almost indiscernible, the white veining is more pronounced and adds appreciably to the desired effect. The rougher the texture the better in this case. It should be noted that several of the members remain unconvinced and believe that selecting a material based solely, it would seem, on a complex intellectual argument would not be fair either to the public or to the aesthetic integrity of the building. It had been hoped that another color more closely related to the walls could be found that would prove more appropriate, and emphasize the water feature by contrast. In fact, one granite in the samples provided by the architects caught our attention in particular. It seemed to several of us that the Giallo Veneziano "Light" --a mix of grey, cream, and gold-- might complement the Kasota stone and would be worth exploring more fully. In any case, the paving pattern received unanimous approval. How closely the stones can be fitted together will be the measure of its success.

This is a clear instance where the full Commission will want to see one or more full-scale mock-ups on or near the site. The paving material selected, how it relates to the Kasota stone, and both the paving as well as the wall joints will be critical to the success of the museum. Let the staff know when this can be arranged. Our next Commission meeting dates are 15 June, 20 July and 21 September.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Michael J. Sofield
Director, Office of Physical Plant
Smithsonian Institution
National Museum of Natural History
10th and Constitution Avenue, NW Suite 79 M
Washington, D.C. 20560

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

23 May 2000

Dear Major Lucas:

During its 18 May 2000 meeting, the Commission approved the designs for the replacement windows for the following eight District of Columbia Public Schools:

1. Birney Elementary School, 2501 M.L. King Ave., SE.
2. Burroughs Elementary School, 1820 Monroe St., NE.
3. Coolidge High School, 6315 5th St., NW.
4. Green Elementary School, 1500 Mississippi, Ave., SE.
5. Shadd Elementary School, 301 Douglas St., NE.
6. Kenilworth Elementary School, 1300 44th St., NE.
7. Luke Moore Academy, 1001 Monroe St., NE.
8. C.W. Harris Elementary School, 301 53rd St., SE.

As with April's submission, the members commend the Baltimore District of the Army Corps of Engineers for their efforts to renew and improve these buildings. Your team's attention to the details and respect for the architectural character of the buildings has been demonstrated and is duly noted, so much so, that for the balance of the window replacement projects, the Commission requests that you submit them to the staff for review and their delegated approval. Please forward them when ready. Any proposal that involves additions or other exterior alterations to the schools or any other property owned by the District of Columbia will still require a formal submission for the Commission's review. As always, staff is available for assistance should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

MAJ. Alex P. Lucas III
Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Baltimore District
2500-A 1st Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001-1022

cc: Phil Scott, Capital Improvements, DC Public Schools
Mark R. Flemming, AIA, Chief
Architecture Section, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT G

23 May 2000

Dear Mr. Finberg:

The Commission was pleased to see you during its meeting of 18 May 2000 for the final design review of the proposed addition to the E. Barrett Prettyman U.S. Courthouse on Constitution Avenue at 3rd Street. The members were unanimous in their approval of the design, material selection, and site modifications. Changing the material and color of the barrel vaults from a green to a soft grey also was approved.

The members also discussed with sculptor Mark Lineweaver his proposal under GSA's Art in Architecture Program. The Commission appreciates the concept of inventing a new iconography for Justice. However, the individual figures struggling under what appear to be great burdens is not the symbolism we feel the court system should provide the public. The artist needs to find a means of expressing the fact that the law is not only complex but helpful and fair. While his solution can be fresh and new, it needs to be clear, unambiguous, and affectively positive.

The Commission looks forward to the further consideration of the sculpture elements as they develop. As always, the staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Jack Finberg
Special Assistant for Regional Coordination
General Services Administration, National Capital Region
301 7th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20407-0001

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

23 May 2000

Dear Ms. Harris:

During the meeting of 18 May 2000, the Commission reviewed the design for the two proposed guard booths at the 9th and 10th Street garage entrances to the Main Justice Department Building. The members appreciated the efforts to make the design of the booths reflect some of the stylistic elements of the building and approved the design contingent upon further study of the roof shape. It was felt that a low pyramidal-shaped roof would be more appropriate than the hip roof that was proposed.

Please submit a revised proposal to the staff for review and their delegated approval when ready. As always, the staff is available for assistance should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Lisa A. Harris, Assistant Director
Real Property Management Service
Facilities and Administrative Services Staff
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I

23 May 2000

Dear Mr. Earle:

The Commission was pleased to see you again during its 18 May 2000 meeting for the review of the "Main Gate Entrance Signs" proposal at the U.S. Naval Observatory. The members felt that internally illuminated signs looked too commercial given your resident client and the residential character of this portion of Massachusetts Avenue, and did not approve the design. It was recommended that the signs should have surface-mounted lettering and, at night, external illumination provided by small fixtures hidden within the planting beds.

In addition, some members questioned the placement of the "lead-in" signs and requested a site inspection so that the location and sight-lines of these two signs can be carefully considered. Perhaps, a simple cardboard mockup can be assembled to help visualize their placement. Arrangements for the site inspection can be made through the staff.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Lawrence P. Earle
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake
Washington Navy Yard Building 212
901 M Street, SE
Washington, D.C. 20374-5018

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT J

23 May 2000

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Ostrom:

During the meeting of 18 May 2000, the Commission reviewed and approved the proposal to restore and renovate Building #39 and to repair the exterior of Building #48 at Fort Lesley J. McNair. The Commission commends the Army for their efforts to preserve the rich character of this landmark military base by rehabilitating these prominent buildings to emulate more closely their original 1904 appearance.

We look forward to future submissions by the Fort Myer Military Community Department of Public Works and, as always, the staff is available to assist you.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Lieutenant Colonel Michael T. Ostrom
Director of Public Works and Logistics
Department of the Army
Headquarters, United States Army Garrison
204 Lee Avenue
Fort Myer, VA 22211-1199

cc: Richard Turner, Acting Director, DPWL, Fort Myer

18 May 2000

EXHIBIT K

**OLD GEORGETOWN ACT**
**AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT**

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 00-112<br>HPA. 00-283 | 3700 O Street, NW<br>Georgetown University<br>Southwest Quadrangle<br>Jesuit Community Residence | New residential/dining maintenance facility - concept development and landscaping |

ACTION: No objection to concept design development for residential, dining, parking and maintenance complex for the proposed Southwest Quadrangle at Georgetown University. Recommend use of real slate for the roofing of the residence hall. File new submission of working drawings, including details, landscape plan and material samples, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

18 May 2000

EXHIBIT L

**SHIPSTEAD-LUCE**
**AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT**

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 00-059 | 770 5th Street, NW<br>Avalon Bay Communities, Inc. | New 12 story apartment building - Design development - Concept |

ACTION: ON HOLD